

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that "[t]his application contains claims 34-42 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper filed 12/3/2004. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01." (emphasis added). However, in the Examiner's Office Action dated March 11, 2005, the Examiner stated that "[c]laims 34-42 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 12/3/2004." (emphasis yours). Furthermore, in the Response to Office Action, dated December 1, 2004, Applicants stated that "[t]he applicant elects the species of Figure 1, **without** traverse." (emphasis added). Therefore, Applicants believe that the requirement in the present Office Action for cancellation is rendered moot.

The Examiner then rejected Claims 1-7, 13, 14, 25, 31, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nunn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,328,891). In response, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate the features of Claims 8 and 9, and Applicants have canceled Claims 8 and 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request removal of this ground of rejection.

More specifically, Applicants aver that Nunn does not teach, disclose, or describe the use of radiating bodies which comprise a ceramic surface. Therefore, Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Nunn.

The Examiner then rejected Claims 1 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Champion (EP 1217302A1). In response, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate the features of Claims 8 and 9, and Applicants have canceled Claims 8 and 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request removal of this ground of rejection.

More specifically, Applicants aver that Champion does not teach, disclose, or describe the use of radiating bodies which comprise a ceramic surface. Therefore, Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Champion.

The Examiner then rejected Claims 1, 13-22, 26-28, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Resmo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,446,623). In response, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate the features of Claims 8 and 9, and Applicants have canceled Claims 8 and 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request removal of this ground of rejection.

More specifically, Applicants aver that Resmo does not teach, disclose, or describe the use of radiating bodies which comprise a ceramic surface. Therefore, Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Resmo.

The Examiner then rejected Claims 1, 13-24, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ashton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,499,480). In response, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate the features of Claims 8 and 9, and Applicants have canceled Claims 8 and 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request removal of this ground of rejection.

More specifically, Applicants aver that Ashton does not teach, disclose, or describe the use of radiating bodies which comprise a ceramic surface. Therefore, Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Ashton.

The Examiner then rejected Claims 1 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Collet (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,450). As noted in Applicants' Amendment, dated July 11, 2005, according to a search on the USPTO website, U.S. Patent No. 6,366,450 was issued on an invention by Michael Janicek and relates to a hideaway integrated docking cradle. Applicants again assume that the Examiner meant to cite U.S. Patent No. 6,336,450 which was issued on an invention by Jean Collet and relates to a terrace heating device. In that regard, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate the features of Claims 8 and 9, and Applicants have canceled Claims 8 and 9. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request removal of this ground of rejection.

More specifically, Applicants aver that Collet does not teach, disclose, or describe the use of radiating bodies which comprise a ceramic surface. Therefore, Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Collet.

The Examiner then rejected Claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nunn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,328,891) in view of Morris et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,889,481). In response, Applicants have canceled Claims 8 and 9. Therefore, this rejection is rendered moot.

The Examiner then rejected Claims 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nunn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,328,891) in view of Waters (U.S. Patent No. 6,651,647). In response, Applicants have Amended Claim 1 to incorporate ceramic surfaces. Since Claims 29 and 30 ultimately depend from Claim 1, these claims also now incorporate ceramic surfaces. Neither Nunn or Waters teach, suggest, or disclose the use of ceramic surfaces. Therefore, even if it were obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Nunn with the teachings of Waters (which Applicants are not admitting, as

detailed in Applicants' Amendment, dated July 11, 2005), that which Applicants claim as the invention would not have been created. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request removal of this ground of rejection.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the present application are in proper form for allowance.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James V. Costigan
Reg. No. 25,669

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
212-302-8989